

# REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 and 19-21 and 24-26 under 35 USC §103. These objections and rejections are fully traversed below. The claims have been amended to correct minor informalities and to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. In addition, claims 27-31 have been added. Claims 1-16 and 19-21 and 24-31 are now pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

## REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-16 and 24-26 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Shoff et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555, ('Shoff' hereinafter) in view of Mao et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,459,427, ('Mao' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art, separately or in combination, neither discloses nor suggests allocating an IP address by a receiver for use in identifying a multicast IP data stream (or associated locator). More particularly, neither of the cited references, separately or in combination, discloses or suggests the use of private IP addresses allocated by the receiver for use in identifying multicast IP data streams (or associated data stream locators, if implemented). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the cited art.

For example, with respect to claim 1, the cited portions of Schoff disclose reading data from a network by a network interface card (modem) upon determination that the address corresponds to a URL or Internet location. See Col. 10, lines 30-33. Thus, the IP address of Schoff is not an IP address allocated by the receiver or mapped by the receiver to a multicast IP data stream, but merely an IP address in the data stream itself. The Examiner admits that Schoff does not disclose that the data stream is a multicast IP data stream,

mapping the locator to an IP address, or a second set of IP addresses identifying one or more multicast data streams. The Examiner seeks to cure the deficiencies of Schoff with Mao.

The Examiner indicates that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the embedded data stream in a television channel of Shoff with the IP-encapsulated MPEG data streams of Mao in order to allow the web browser software of Shoff (106) to access HTML data embedded in the MPEG video stream using a widely-accepted native transport protocol (IP)..." However, it is important to note that the claimed invention does not modify the data stream, but rather identifies multicast IP data streams within the receiver by assigning an IP address to each multicast IP data stream. Neither of the cited references, separately or in combination, discloses or suggests the claimed invention.

Mao discloses HTML program association tables and program map tables, which are generated by the server headend and transmitted periodically to the client. See col. 8, lines 8-34. Thus, Mao's control maps are generated by the server and not by the receiver, as claimed. As such, Mao teaches away from the claimed invention. Moreover, the combination of the cited references would fail to operate as claimed. The additional cited references fail to cure the deficiencies of the primary references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103.

The independent and dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish them from the cited references. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed, as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103(a).


If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee

required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. SUN1P505).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Elise R. Heilbrunn  
Reg. No. 42,649

BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP  
P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100